

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claim 9 is objected to because of informality. Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, and claims 1-8 and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objection

Claim 9, which is objected to because of informality, has been amended by deleting the extraneous word "second" after the words "synchronization signal".

The object of claim 9 is therefore overcome.

Claim Rejections

A. Rejection of claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because of insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the first wireless communications network" in line 2.

Applicants submit that claim 10 does not recite "the first wireless communications network." Nonetheless, claim 10 has been amended to recite "a second network synchronization signal," thus providing for proper antecedent basis.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite "the telephony network", thereby providing for proper antecedent basis.

Rejection of claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is therefore overcome.

B. Rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Brideglall (US 2007/0091845 A1) in view of Nassir-Toussi et al. (US 7194011 B1, hereinafter, "Nassiri-Toussi").

Without conceding to the Office Action's statement that paragraph [0012] of Brideglall teaches the features in the broadcasting step of claim 1, Applicants nonetheless has amended

claim 1 to clarify the invention in order to expedite the prosecution of the application. The amended claim 1 further recites that the second network synchronization signal is transmitted at a same frequency as the first network synchronization signal. Support can be found, for example, at least on p.4, lines 19-29 of the original specification (or paragraph [0017] of the published application, US 2008/0247378). Thus, no new matter has been added.

Applicants submit that there is no showing of Brideglall teaching this feature of the second network synchronization signal being transmitted at a same frequency as the first network synchronization signal.

Furthermore, the Office Action acknowledged that Brideglall does not teach the feature of "generating in the second network a second network synchronization channel having a prescribed pattern unique to the second network." Thus, Nassir-Toussi was cited (e.g., col. 2, line 23 – col. 3, line 36; and col. 8, line 33 – col. 9, line 5) for allegedly teaching this generating step that is missing in Brideglall.

Applicants submit that Nassiri-Toussi teaches only a handoff between different base stations within a single wireless network, and that the primary and secondary synchronization signals are transmitted by a base station. There is no teaching in Nassir-Toussi of a second network transmitting a synchronization signal at the same frequency as the synchronization signal of a first network, and the second synchronization signal having a pattern unique to the second network.

Thus, even if combined, Brideglall and Nassiri-Toussi still would not have resulted in Applicants' invention as provided in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Brideglall and Nassir-Toussi.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite features similar to those of claim 1. For at least the same reasons set forth above, claim 4 is also patentable over Brideglall and Nassir-Toussi.

Since claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, and claims 5-8 depend from claim 4, for at least the same reasons set forth above, these dependent claims are also patentable over Brideglall and Nassiri-Toussi.

C. Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102 and claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Brideglall, and claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Bridegall and Nassir-Toussi.

Claim 9 has been amended to further recite that the second network synchronization signal is transmitted at a same frequency as the first network synchronization signal.

As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 4, Brideglall does not teach at least this feature of the first and second synchronization signals. Thus, for the same reasons set forth above, claim 9 is also patentable over Brideglall.

Since claims 10-11 depend from claim 9, and there is no showing that Nassir-Toussi teaches at least this feature missing in Brideglall, claims 10-11 are also patentable over the combination of Brideglall and Nassir-Toussi.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

October 19, 2009
Date

/Wan Yee Cheung/
Wan Yee Cheung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,410

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08540